

REMARKS

Claims 19 to 34 are in the application. Claims 19 and 27 have been amended. Applicants reserve their right to file divisional or continuation applications on cancelled or deleted subject matter. Support for the amendment lies in the specification on page 7, last paragraph, and in the cited US Patents 6,350,469 and US 6,372,253. No new matter is believed added.

Applicants respectfully request the grant of an interview with the Examiner if the claims are not found in condition for allowance upon review of this response. The Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the number indicated below to set up such a meeting, if necessary.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the withdrawal of the rejection to the claims as listed in the Office Action, page 2, paragraphs 3, 4 and 5, and page 3, paragraphs 6 and 7.

Rejection under 35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 19 to 34 remain rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Dressman et al. (US Patent 5,789,393) for the reasons of record. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The Examiner states that Applicants claims do not contain a specific viscosity grade of methylcellulose to remove a rejection over the Dressman patent. Claims 19 and 27 have been amended to recite a viscosity of 4000 centipoise. It is believed that this amendment should therefore render the anticipation rejection over Dressman moot.

Consequently, withdrawal of the rejections to the claims under 35 USC §102(e) is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 USC §103

Claims 19 to 23, 25 to 31, 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being anticipated by Dressman et al., in view of Durlach (US Patent 4,232,054). Applicants respectfully traverse all of these rejections.

For reasons similar to that above, Dressman does not teach use of methylcellulose having a viscosity of 4000 centipoise for the purposes as claimed herein. This failure is not remedied by the teachings of Durlach.

Durlach does not disclose the claimed method of use herein. Durlach attempts to remedy the loss of calcium, magnesium etc. by the chelating action of various fibers, by adding to the diet, various metallic proteins, i.e. ca, mg, iron, zinc, etc. as contained in milk or egg protein, to the vegetable fibers, i.e. wheat bran. Durlach does

not teach Applicants invention, and therefore when taken with Dressman et al. does not render Applicants claims unpatentable.

In light of these remarks and amendments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to the claims under 35 USC §103 (a).

CONCLUSION

Should the Examiner have any questions or wish to discuss any aspect of this case, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at the number below. If any additional fees or charges are required by this paper the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit account 19-2570 accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,



Dara L. Dinner
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33,680

SMITHKLINE BEECHAM CORP.
Corp. Intellectual Property-U.S. (UW2220)
P.O. Box 1539
King of Prussia, PA 19406
(610) 270-5017 - Telephone
(610) 270-5090 - Facsimile
75087oa3RCE.doc